

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. **FILING DATE** Kazue Kudo 16869G-087100US 10/665,910 09/18/2003 7077 20350 09/19/2005 **EXAMINER** 7590 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP BERNATZ, KEVIN M TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834 1773

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/665,910	KUDO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kevin M. Bernatz	1773	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin M. Bernatz	1773				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
 The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). 						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. stutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). MENDMENTS						
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a 			the issues for			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		jected craims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	. ,,	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none		ill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>3,4 and 8-11</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: 3,4 and 8-11.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1 and 5-7.</u>						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(nils to provide a (1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered buseen Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	_			
13. Other:		Kevin M. Bernatz	5			
		Kevin M. Bernatz	PhD			
		Primary Examine	1 allalos			

9/10/03

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed language was not previously considered and would therefor require further search and/or consideration. In addition, the Examiner notes that the prior art of record teaches forming the pole tips of the high Ms material reading on the claimed composition limitations. The pole tips of a magnetic head are formed adjacent the magnetic gap layer (see Ohashi et al., col. 4, lines 56 - 65 where element 4 is the magnetic gap layer)..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicants' arguments are directed to the unentered amendment. In so far as they apply to the rejection of record, the Examiner notes that attacking individual references cannot overcome a rejection predicated on the combination of the references. Chen et al. teach the composition for use as the high Ms layer taught by Ohashi et al., while Ohashi et al. teach the claimed structure.